

REMARKS

Claims 3, 8-12, 14-16, 20, and 21 were pending in the present application prior to amendment herein, and claims 3, 8, 12, and 14 have been amended. No new matter has been added to this application by these amendments, with support being found in the specification, claims and figures as filed. Support for the amendments to claims 3, 8, 12, and 14 can be found, for example, in paragraph [0008] of the present application (as published). In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully requests entry of this Amendment and consideration of the present application as amended herein.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 3, 8-12, 14-16, 20, and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Prague reference. In paragraph 9 of the Office Action dated June 28, 2007, the Examiner asserts that the limitation “wherein when one of the plurality of records is deleted, the task numbers of the remaining records are not renumbered” is disclosed in the Prague reference. In support of this, the passage on lines 11-18 of page 138 of the Prague reference is cited. This passage, however, does not relate to a primary key field in which a “unique ... number is assigned permanently to each of the records in the database,” as presently recited in independent claims 3 and 12. This passage instead refers to a user-designated number, in this case a “Pet ID” number, which is assigned by a hypothetical user to a record, and there is no indication that his number is permanently assigned to the record such that it cannot be changed by the user.

With respect to the automatic assignment of numbers to records in a database, the Prague reference does refer to an AutoNumber field in lines 1-3 of page 138, and states that “[t]his field will contain a unique number for each record in the table, and Access will maintain it automatically” (page 138, lines 2-3, emphasis added). Such “automatic” maintenance, however, suggests automatic renumbering of the numbers in this AutoNumber field as records are added and deleted, and does not present a prima facie showing that the numbers in this field are either not renumbered when one of the plurality

of records is deleted, or that they are assigned permanently to each of the records in the database.

The method and program of independent claims 3 and 12, respectively, prevents key violations in a different manner than the foregoing methods used by the Access program, namely by assigning a unique task number to each record in a database and by not renumbering such task numbers when one is deleted. This avoids the need to check for duplicate data in this field, as is required in the Access program (see Prague, page 138, lines 8-9). Moreover, this allows data to be displayed in a manner independent of the ordering of the task number field. By contrast, Prague states that “Access will display your data in the order of the primary key” (Prague, page 138, line 10).

The present method and program therefore provide advantages not suggested by the Prague reference. Through the use of this method and program, end users can enjoy more flexibility and freedom with respect to reordering tasks, while retaining a unique task number for tracking each of such tasks and avoiding key violations. For example, a user of the present method and program can rearrange priorities in a priority field, assign duplicate priorities (e.g., two “#1 priorities”), and assign such priorities the same due date without causing a key violation. End users can thus become more efficient and productive in their work environment through the use of the present method and program.

Through the use of sequential task numbers, as recited in claims 8 and 14, an end user can also keep track of the order in which tasks are entered into a database, since the task numbers are both sequential and assigned permanently to a record. This feature is also not suggested by the Prague reference.

Claims 9-11, 15, 16, 20, and 21 depend from one of claims 3 or 12, and are therefore patentable for the reasons stated above, in addition to containing independently patentable features. In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 3, 8-12, 14-16, 20, and 21 are patentable over the Prague reference, and respectfully requests that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Conclusion

The Applicant respectfully requests entry of the foregoing amendments and the issuance of a Notice of Allowance in this case. If any issues remain which can be resolved by communicating with the Applicants' representative by telephone, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Please charge any fees due in connection with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-2090.

Respectfully submitted,

SHELDON MAK ROSE & ANDERSON

Date: January 4, 2008

By: /michael fedrick/
Michael Fedrick
Reg. No. 36,799

100 E. Corson Street, Third Floor
Pasadena, California 91103-3842
(626) 796-4000
Customer No. 23676